

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF WISCONSIN

SCOT PERKET,

Plaintiff,

v.

LA CROSSE COUNTY POLICE DEPARTMENT,

Defendants.

ORDER

Case No. 16-cv-362-wmc

SCOT PERKET,

Plaintiff,

v.

ST. FRANCIS OF MAYO HEALTH CARE LA
CROSSE (COUNTY), et al.

Defendants.

ORDER

Case No. 16-cv-507-wmc

SCOT PERKET,

Plaintiff,

v.

LA CROSSE COUNTY JAIL DEPUTIES, et al.

Defendants.

ORDER

Case No. 16-cv-525-wmc

Between May of 2016 and January of 2017, *pro se* plaintiff Scot Alan Perket filed 13 lawsuits in which he makes numerous vague allegations about a host of defendants that he claims amount to violations of his state and federal rights. Several of his cases have been terminated for his failure to pay the filing fee, and the court is reviewing others to determine whether subject matter jurisdiction exists.¹ In the three cases listed above, Perket has paid

¹

The following cases have been dismissed for failure to pay the filing fee: 16-cv-485-wmc; 16-cv-579-wmc; 16-cv-652-wmc; 16-cv-709-wmc; and 17-cv-24-wmc. The cases that are under subject matter jurisdiction review are: 16-cv-396-wmc, 16-cv-568-wmc, 16-cv-586-wmc, 16-cv-824-wmc; 16-cv-859-wmc.

the full filing fee and the court has issued summonses for Perket to serve on the defendants in accordance with Rule 4 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. In each of those cases in which Perket has attempted service, some or all of defendants have filed motions to dismiss on various grounds, including for lack of personal and subject matter jurisdiction. (Case No. 16-cv-362-wmc, dkt. 8; Case No. 16-cv-507-wmc, dkt. 8, 13; Case No. 16-cv-525, dkt. 9, 16.)

Perket's opposition deadline in Case No. 16-cv-362 was July 26, 2016; his opposition deadlines for the two motions to dismiss in Case No. 16-cv-507-wmc were October 17 and 28, 2016; and his opposition deadlines for the two motions to dismiss in Case No. 16-cv-525 were October 14 and 18, 2016. Yet Perket has filed *nothing* in any of these cases since August of 2016: No opposing briefs, no requests for extensions of time to respond, no other filings of any sort. This is especially troubling because since these motions by the defendants have been filed, Perket has continued to file new complaints in this court. Perket's inaction in the instant three cases leads the court to infer that he does not actually wants to litigate the cases that he has filed.

Nonetheless, courts must treat *pro se* litigants like Perket leniently. I will give Perket the opportunity to: (1) explain whether his complete failure to respond to these motions occurred for good reason, and (2) file oppositions to the pending motions to dismiss. The court will permit Perket two weeks until **April 3, 2017**, to explain his failure to respond **and** to submit complete responses to the pending motions to dismiss in Case Nos. 16-cv-362-wmc, 16-cv-507, and 16-cv-525. If Perket fails to respond by this deadline, then the presiding judge will take the defendant's motions under advisement. A likely outcome would be dismissal of these three lawsuits due to Perket's failure to prosecute them.

ORDER

IT IS ORDERED that Plaintiff Scot Perket is **DIRECTED** to **SHOW CAUSE** by **April 3, 2017**, by responding to defendants' pending motions to dismiss by:

(1) Filing a document that explains why he failed to file timely oppositions to defendants' motions to dismiss in Case No. 16-cv-362-wmc (dkt. #8), Case No. 16-cv-507-wmc, (dkt. #8, 13) and Case No. 16-cv-525-wmc (dkt. #9, 16); and

(2) Filing complete substantive responses to these motions.

Entered this 20th day of March, 2017.

BY THE COURT:

/s/

STEPHEN L. CROCKER
Magistrate Judge